

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 6 November 2003. Responsive to the Office Action, Claims 1, 10, and 12-14 have now been amended, and Claim 15 has been newly-inserted for further prosecution with the other pending Claims. It is believed that with such amendment and insertion of Claims, there is a further clarification of Applicant's invention for this Patent Application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4, 6, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over the Meyer et al. reference. In setting forth this rejection, the Examiner relied upon both the docking station embodiment of Figs. 1 and 12, and the recharger embodiment of FIGS. 13 and 14. The Examiner also relied upon the interconnection cord shown in Fig. 1 as showing the claimed output cord, and upon the passage at column 12, lines 26-35 for disclosing the simultaneous charging of a plurality of portable devices.

The Examiner rejected Claims 2, 5, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Meyer et al. reference in combination with the Cho reference. In setting forth this rejection, the Examiner relied upon the Cho reference for disclosing a spool unit, and an attachment clip, concluding that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate such features into the Meyer et al. device.

The Examiner rejected Claim 3 also under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer et al. in combination with the Sadler reference. The Examiner cited Sadler for disclosing a charger having a foldable mounting stage, and concluded again that it would have been obvious to incorporate such feature into the Meyer et al. device.

The Examiner additionally rejected Claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer et al. in combination with the Tung et al. reference. The Examiner cited Tung et al. for disclosing an input end 25 and an output cord 3 connected to a circuit board, with the plug being connected to a connector 32 through an input cord for use with various charging device types. The Examiner reasoned again that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated such features into the Meyer et al. device.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 9, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Meyer et al. reference in combination with the Huang reference. Citing Huang for disclosing a portable charger whose board is connected to a battery connector 241, the Examiner concluded once again that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated such feature into the Meyer et al. device. The Examiner similarly reasoned, citing Huang for various other features, including an input end and output cord being connected to a circuit board; a mounting stage being connected to a body; spring

contacts extending into the mounting stage; and, the mounting stage being detachably assembled to the body.

As for Claim 14, the Examiner merely objected to the Claim as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner indicated that the Claim would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim. Accordingly, Claim 14 is now amended to independent form, incorporating the subject matter of Claim 13 from which it had depended. Thus, it is believed that Claim 14 is now in allowable form.

The remaining independent Claims 1, 10, and 12 have each been amended to now more clearly recite a portable multi-function charger having among its features “a circuit section arranged in the cavity [of a body] and having a circuit board,” as well as certain elements “each connected to the circuit board for detachably coupling a portable device to the circuit section.” As the Claims further recite, a mounting stage is connected to the body, with the circuit board-connected elements “provid[ing] for simultaneous charging of a plurality of portable devices.”

The full combination of these and other features now more clearly recited by Applicant’s pending claims is nowhere disclosed by the primarily-cited Meyer et al. reference. That reference is directed to a portable transaction terminal system in which a notebook computer-like portable transaction terminal 10 is provided for use by servers at eating and drinking establishments. As shown in

Fig. 1, the system employs a docking station 20 for receiving the portable transaction terminal 10. This docking station 20 is interconnected in this particular embodiment to a credit card swiper/transaction terminal 30 for communication therewith. An exploded view of the docking station 20 for this embodiment is shown in Fig. 12 detailing, among other things, a “female telephone receptacle 211” that enables interconnection to the credit card transaction terminal 30. The docking station 20 is formed with no other points of interconnection to any external device.

As an alternative embodiment, the reference prescribes in FIGS. 13 and 14 an “adaptation of the docking station components shown in FIG. 12 to provide a single unit recharger 215 for portable transaction terminal 10,” (column 12; lines 16-18). In this “single unit recharger” embodiment, the female telephone receptacle 211 of the docking station is replaced by a power jack 225 for “use[] with an external DC power supply unit to provide power to electronic circuit board 222,” (column 12; lines 30-31). As the reference goes on to explain, the resulting recharger 215 is specifically configured for providing at any given time a smart recharging function for a “single unit,” namely, a single portable transaction terminal 10.

Such explication teaches diametrically away from any “simultaneous charging of a plurality of portable devices” that each of Applicant’s newly-amended independent Claims 1, 10, and 12 now more clearly recites. The Meyer,

et al. reference nowhere even suggests anything more than a single female telephone receptacle 211, or – alternatively in its place - a single power jack 225, for interconnection to an external device. The reference thus precludes the combined provision of such elements as “at least one input, an output circuit, and an output cord” (recited by Claim 1, for example) “each connected to the circuit board for detachably coupling a portable device to the circuit section,” that provide with “the plurality of spring contacts” - for “simultaneous charging of a plurality of portable devices,” as the Claims now clearly recite.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies concurrently upon the components disclosed in Fig. 12 and the features described in the passage at column 12, lines 16-35. Note, however, that the passage at column 12, lines 16-35 pertains necessarily to the recharger embodiment shown in Figs. 13-14 whose components are provided in lieu of the components provided in the docking station embodiment shown in Fig. 12. Also, the Examiner’s reliance upon the passage at column 12 lines 26-35 in attributing to Meyer, et al. the teaching of simultaneously charging a plurality of portable devices is puzzling. That passage makes no mention of any such simultaneous charging of plural devices. To the contrary, the passage relates quite plainly to the components of the “single unit recharger 215” introduced in the immediately preceding paragraph.

Given the contrary teachings of the primarily-cited Meyer et al. reference, the teachings of the secondarily-cited Cho, Sadler, Tung et al., and Huang

references are found to be quite ineffectual to the present patentability analysis. The points of distinction noted in Applicant's earlier Amendment regarding these references apply with even more force here.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the cited Meyer et al., Cho, Sandler, Tung et al., and Huang references, even when considered together, fail to disclose the unique combination of elements now more clearly recited by Applicant's pending claims for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jun Y. Lee
Registration #40,262

Dated: 2/5/2004

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee
Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678

